<u>**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**</u>

This paper is being submitted in response to the non-final Office Action dated December 28, 2007. Claims 1-48 were previously pending. Claims 25-26, 29-30, 33, 37-38, 41-48 have been amended and claims 1-24 have been cancelled herein. Claims 25-48 remain currently pending. No new matter has been added.

<u>**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**</u>

Claims 1-7, 9-15, 17-23, 25-31, 33-39, and 41-47 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,430,624 issued to Jamtgaard et al., (hereinafter, *Jamtgaard*), in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,615,131 issued to Rennard et al., (hereinafter, *Rennard*), and in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,707,809, issued to Warrier et al. (hereinafter, *Warrier*). Claims 8, 16, 24, 32, 40, and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jamtgaard* in view of *Rennard* and in view of *Warrier* and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,148,330 issued to Puri et al., (hereinafter, *Puri*).

Claims 1-24 have been cancelled, rendering their disposition presently moot. Regarding the grounds for rejecting independent claim 25, the Office Action asserts that *Jamtgaard* discloses in response to a request for a first data page from the second data processing system, sending a reduced-content data page, corresponding to the first data page, from the first data processing system to the second data processing system. Furthermore, the Office Action asserts that *Warrier* discloses subject matter equivalent to a step of in response to the request from the second data processing system, sending the first data page from the first data processing system to a third data processing system that is separate and distinct from the second. Applicants note that the noted disclosure by *Warrier* relates to a method for forwarding data from a data source to an idle mobile node which, similar to *Jamtgaard*, does not appear to address a need to send a full version and a reduced content version of a requested page in response to the same data request.

Furthermore, Applicants note that amended claim 25 recites steps of "selectively sending a *selection mark* to the second data processing system" and "in further response to the request from the second data processing system *and if a request corresponding to the selection mark is received,* sending the first data page from the first data processing system to a third data processing system having a common user association with the second data processing system."

Applicants submit that the combination of *Jamtgaard, Rennard, Warrier,* and *Puri* fails to disclose or suggest sending a selection mark to the requestor and using receipt of a request containing the selection mark as a condition for whether to send the first data page in addition to the reduced content page. Applicants thus believe the grounds of rejection have been overcome and a notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants thus believe the grounds of rejection for claims 25, 33, 41 and all claims depending therefrom have been overcome and a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney of record at (512) 343-6116 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew W. Baca
Reg. No. 42,277
DILLON & YUDELL LLP
8911 North Capital of Texas Highway, Ste. 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
Telephone (512) 343-6116
Facsimile (512) 343-6446

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS